

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed March 5, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to remove the phrase “capable of being.”

Claims 7, 9-11, 22, 24-26, 44, 46-48, 65-66 and 68-70 have been amended to remove the phrase “may be changed.” Withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

**Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 14-17, 19-21, 23, 29, 31-38, 41-43, 45, 53-54, 56-57, 59-60, 62-64, 67 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Shukuri (U.S. pat. no. 6,529,407).

Claim 1 is directed to an electronic fuse that is used to configure a circuit to one of two possible configurations. As amended, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

...at least one nonvolatile memory element, said at least one nonvolatile memory element configured to be programmed to a memory value capable of causing the output of said logic gate to settle to one of first or second predetermined states as a power-up or a reset signal is applied to the fuse, the first predetermined state of the output of the logic gate establishing a first configuration of the circuit, the second predetermined state of the output of the logic gate establishing a second configuration of the circuit.

These features are not disclosed in Shukuri, which is directed to a latch device for writing in and reading out addresses of particular circuits (and specifically, relief circuits and circuits that are to-be-relieved) of a device. Considering for example the limitation from Claim 1 of “the first predetermined state of the output of the logic gate establishing a first configuration of the circuit, the second predetermined state of the output of the logic gate establishing a second configuration of the circuit,” no counterpart appears in Shukuri. Shukuri is simply a memory for storing the address of two circuits—the relief circuit and the circuit being relieved. First and second

configurations of a particular circuit are not established based on first and second predetermined states of the output of a logic gate, as called for by Claim 1.

Moreover, Claim 1 requires that the fuse be activated by a power-up or reset signal, consistent with conventional fuse operation. No such signals are provided in Shukuri. The allegation in the Office Action that readout control circuit 103 provides this missing feature is simply a mischaracterization of Shukuri's disclosure. Since, as previously explained, Shukuri does not disclose a fuse, but a latch device, there would be no need to provide the latch device of Shukuri with a power-up or reset signal, as these terms are understood to mean in the art of fuses.

It will be appreciated that, according to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if each and every claim element is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.<sup>1</sup> The aforementioned reasons clearly indicate the contrary, and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of Claim 1, and of Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 12, 14-17, 19-21, 23, 29, 31-38, 41-43, 45, 53-54, 56-57, 59-60, 62-64, and 67 containing similar features to those discussed above, based on Shukuri is respectfully urged.

**Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 3, 13, 18, 27, 39-40, 49-50, 58, 61, 71 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shukuri (U.S. pat. no. 6,529,407) in view of Goetting et al. (U.S. pat. no. 5,912,937).

Claims 7, 9-11, 22, 24-26, 44, 46-48, 65-66 and 68-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shukuri (U.S. pat. no. 6,529,407) in view of Madurawe (U.S. pub. no. 2005/0149896).

Claims 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shukuri (U.S. pat. no. 5,912,937) in view of Pascucci et al. (U.S. pat. no. 5,659,498).

---

<sup>1</sup> Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2131. See also *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claims 51-53 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shukuri (U.S. pat. no. 6,529,407) in view of Hartgring et al. (U.S. pat. no. 5,086,331).

As explained above, Shukuri fails to disclose or suggest the features discussed above from Claim 1. These features also appear in the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and their absence from Shukuri is not remedied by any of the other applied references.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fees, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Amendment and/or Reply to Office Action, or credit any overpayment not otherwise credited, to our deposit account no. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,  
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: 05/02/2007



Khaled Shami  
Reg. No. 38,745

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 282-1855  
Fax. (408) 287-8040